REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-18, 21, 24, 25, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 52 have been amended herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Shanton (5,369,702 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Generally speaking, the present invention is directed to a security technique that uses objects *and methods contained therein* to define and manage security. In contrast, the cited reference teaches use of a special purpose application (OOKeyMan) to manage and track encrypted objects. While both references describe objects and security, that is where the similarly ends. Shanton is directed to providing security of the objects themselves, whereas the present invention uses the objects themselves to provide security for other items. Specifically, Shanton provides security of the objects themselves using a standalone application called an OOKeyMan application which is launched in order to authenticate a user's access to a given object (col. 5, lines 51-58). This application is stated to be a standalone Microsoft Windows application (col. 4, lines 59-61). In contrast, the present invention maintains security attributes and methods *within an object itself* such that the *object itself* can provide security for other items (Specification page 14, lines 16-26). A simple analogy can further clarify this distinction. Assume the existence of a lock and key. The present invention is akin to specific techniques for using the key (analogous to the 'security object') to open the lock (analogous to 'an item'). The teachings of Shanton are akin to techniques for restricting access to the key (the key being analogous to Shanton's encrypted 'objects') itself, such as by locking the key in a safe (the safe being analogous to Shanton's OOKeyMan application).

Specifically with respect to Claim 1, such claim recites a technique for creating a *security object for use in securing an item.* As a part of such technique, the claim recites a step of encapsulating security object data and the one or more attributes with one or more methods, *wherein the security object is used to control access to secured contents.*

In contrast, the cited Shanton reference teaches use of a *standalone windows application* that is used to control access to objects (col. 4, lines 59-61; col. 5, lines 51-58). Applicants have amended Claim 1 to further emphasize this distinction. It is thus urged that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 2-17 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2-17 depend upon).

Further with respect to Claim 4, Applicants urge that the cited reference does not teach the claimed feature of "wherein the one or more methods operate on the security object data and input data provided by the user and passed to the security object". As can be seen, this claim is specifically directed to an internal method within the security object, and using this internal method to operate on both (1) the security object data, and (2) input data that is passed to the security object. The cited reference does not teach or otherwise suggest this claimed feature. In rejecting Claim 4, the Examiner cites Shanton fig. 1 and 3 and associated text; col. 4-5). Applicants urge that while this DCOM system is used to control which objects are visible to a specific user (col. 5, lines 18-23), an internal method within the object itself is *not* used as a part of this process, and in particular an internal method within an object is *not* described as operating on both security object data of the security object as well as input data that is passed to the security object. Rather, a standalone Windows application is used to manage the objects themselves. Claim 4 has been amended to further emphasize this distinction, in that the internal method *within the security object itself* operates on user supplied data in order to authenticate the user to access an item. Thus, it is urged that Claim 4 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

Further with respect to Claim 7, Applicants have amended such claim to recite a feature of "providing the security object to a security system, wherein the security system is a hardware data processing system that stores the security object and associates the security object with a user identification so that the security object may be retrieved when the user enters their identification in order to gain access to the item", as described at Specification page 17, line 26 – page 18, line 8. The cited reference does not teach or otherwise suggest a hardware data processing system that stores the security object and associates it with user identification so that the security object may be retrieved upon

occurrence of the user entering their identification in order to gain access to a separate item (i.e. the user is attempting to access an item whose access is controllable by the security object). In contrast, the cited reference teaches an access control technique for the objects themselves. Thus, it is urged that amended Claim 7 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 18-34 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

Further with respect to Claim 21, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 4.

Further with respect to Claim 24, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 7.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 35-51 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

Further with respect to Claim 38, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 4.

Further with respect to Claim 41, Applicants traverse for similar reasons to the further reasons given above with respect to Claim 7.

With respect to Claim 52, the Examiner uses the same reasoning in rejecting such claim as the reasoning given in rejecting Claims 1, 4, 8 and 13. Applicants urge error, as Claims 1, 4, 8 and 13 are directed to a method for *generating* a security object, whereas Claim 52 is substantially different in that it is directed to a method of *using* a security object. In particular, the security object is *used to control access* to content. The objects as described by the cited reference are not used to control access. Rather, they are the actual objects whose access is being controlled by a standalone Windows application. Applicants have amended Claim 52 to further emphasize this distinction. It is thus urged that Claim 52 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited reference and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 8/15/05

Respectfully submitted,

Cathrine K. Kinslow
Reg. No. 51,886
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorneys for Applicants